REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending with this paper. Claims 1-20 are rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 and adding claim 21.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the objection to claim 20. Applicant notes that the Office Action cites new prior art (Corder). Furthermore, the Office Action does not provide further arguments regarding the amended claims and the previously cited prior art of Amado, Tatsuoka, Foster, and Bogle.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,302,132 (Corder).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, **the at least one profile using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain."** (Emphasis added.) The amendment is support by the present patent application as originally filed, e.g., (Page 9, line 17 – page 10, line 6; Figure 5). The specification discloses (Page 32, line 17 – page 10, line 6. Emphasis added.):

> A profile is composed of two types of structures: characteristics and collective characteristics. A characteristic is a conditional (the if half of a rule) that identifies a subset of the domain that is important for determining what feedback to deliver to the student. Example characteristics include: Wrong debit account in transaction 1; Prefect cost classification; At least 1 DUI in the last 3 years; and More than two at-fault accidents in 5 years. A characteristic's conditional uses one or more atomics as the operands to identify the subset of the domain that defines the characteristic. An atomic only makes reference to a single property to a single property of a single entity in the domain; thus the term atomic. Example atomics include: The number of DUI's >= 1; ROI > 10%; and income between $75,000 and $110,000. **A collective characteristic is a conditional that uses multiple characteristics and/or other collective characteristics as its operands.** Collective characteristics allow instructional designer to build richer expressions (i.e., ask more complex questions). Example collective characteristics include: Bad Household driving record; Good Credit Rating; Marginal Credit Rating; Problems with Cash for Expense Transactions; and Problems with

Sources and uses of cash. **Once created, designers are able to reuse there elements with multiple expressions, which significantly eases the burden of creating additional profiles.** When building a profile form its elements, atomics can be used by multiple characteristics, characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles, and collective characteristics and profiles, and collective characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles. Figure 5 illustrates an insurance underwriting profile in accordance with a preferred embodiment.

The Office Action alleges that Corder teaches (Page 3, section 4.):

> ... monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (Corder, C7:35-44; 'True' of applicant is equivalent to 'completeness' of Corder. Corder illustrates feedback in this passage as well.)
> ...

Corder does disclose (Column 7, lines 35-44.):

> The method provides immediate feedback on the correct response expect. For example, if the instructional objective is to teach the student how to take notes during a lecture on the benefits to the general public of the space station program, the student's typed "notes" are analyzed by the system and feedback is provided to the student in several forms. One such form is a recommended set of notes for the lecture. Another is an analysis of the notes made by the student with respect to their completeness and relevance to the topic.

Corder does not even suggest the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, the at least one profile using a **plurality** of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." (Emphasis added.) Corder merely discloses a single objective for teaching "the student how to take notes during a lecture on the benefits to the general public of the space station program." Similarly, Corder further discloses selecting a target instructional objective from a plurality of hierarchically ranked objectives. (Column 3, lines 42-49.)

Applicant is amending claim 10 to include the similar feature of "logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, the at least one profile using a plurality of

characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." Applicant is also amending claim 19 to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, the at least one profile using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." Claims 10 and 19 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, and are patentable for at least the above reasons. Moreover, claim 5 includes the feature of "including displaying **source code** of the presentation as the presentation executes." (Emphasis added.) The Office Action alleges that (Page 4, section 4. Emphasis added.):

> Corder anticipates displaying source code of the presentatior [presentator] as the presentation executes. (Corder, C5 17-27; **'Displaying source code' of applicant is equivalent to the results of the 'display' of Corder.**)

However, Corder merely teaches displaying content (e.g., phonograms, icons, or buttons) that results from the source code and <u>fails</u> to even suggest displaying the source code itself. Similarly, claim 14 includes the feature of "including logic that displays source code of the presentation as the presentation executes." Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-20.

Applicant is adding claim 21, which depends from claim 1 and is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 9, line 32 – page 10, line 6. All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2006

Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001